

---

# **Solicitation of 2000 Census Content Needs From Non-Federal Data Users: November 1994– March 1995**

---

Bureau of the Census  
Decennial Management Division  
November 1995

# Solicitation of 2000 Census Content Needs From Non-Federal Data Users

## FINAL REPORT

November 1995

---

Contents	Page
Stateside .....	1
<i>Introduction</i> .....	1
<i>Description of the Survey</i> .....	2
<i>Promotional and Outreach Activities</i> .....	2
<i>Mailout and Other Distribution of the Survey</i> .....	3
<i>Respondent Profile and Comparison with Pre-1990 Census Local Public Meetings</i> .....	3
<i>Findings for the Required and Programmatic Topics</i> .....	4
<i>Findings for the Mandated Topics</i> .....	8
<i>Limitations</i> .....	10
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	10
<i>Other Data Needs</i> .....	11
<i>Implications for 2000 Census Content Planning</i> .....	11
<i>Dissemination Plans</i> .....	11
<i>Participants in the Content Planning Process</i> .....	11
<i>Other Related Work</i> .....	12
<i>Other Materials</i> .....	12
Attachments*	
A.    Distribution of Non-Federal Data User Survey	
B.    Suggested New Content for the 2000 Census Reported on the Non-Federal Survey	
C.    Dissemination of Findings	
D.    Final Reports Submitted by the Association of Public Data Users (APDU)	
E.    Summary of Results From State Data Center Surveys	

\*Available upon request. Please contact Karen Mills/Gloria Porter on (301) 457-4019.

---

# Solicitation of 2000 Census Content Needs From Non-Federal Data Users

## Final Report

November 1995

Decennial Management Division  
Bureau of the Census

### Stateside

#### Introduction

As part of the content development process for the 2000 census, the Census Bureau has been working to assess data needs from both the Federal and non-Federal sectors. In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), **Federal** data requirements were inventoried and classified according to whether a Federal department or agency reported a specific legislative justification for including a topic in the decennial census. To obtain **non-Federal** requirements, the Bureau conducted the **Survey of Census Needs of Non-Federal Data Users** (NFDU).<sup>1</sup> The survey was designed to collect information on the subject needs, uses of specific items, the geographic needs, and availability of alternative data sources of the non-Federal data user community.

To establish Federal needs, the Census Bureau reviewed Federal agencies' responses to an OMB inquiry as to whether the 1990 census topics were mandated, required, or programmatic. *Mandated* topics are those whose need for decennial census data is specifically cited in Federal legislation. *Required* topics are explicitly required by law, and although decennial census data are not specifically cited, they are the only source for the topic or the source historically used. *Programmatic* topics are used for program planning, implementation, or evaluation, or to provide legal evidence. However, Federal law does not explicitly require that data be used. The NFDU survey used this same classification scheme to structure and evaluate its inquiry of content needs.

The programmatic topics are considered most at risk of not being included on the 2000 census questionnaires because they do not have an explicit legislative requirement. In addition, some members of Congress have stated that the 1990 census sample questionnaire was too long and went beyond the Census Bureau's constitutional mandate to enumerate the population. Thus, we must assess very carefully the need for the questions proposed for the 2000 census.

---

<sup>1</sup> The non-Federal solicitation process originated from an Action Plan that was announced in May 1994 and developed by the Census Bureau at the request of OMB.

---

## Description of the Survey

The NFDU survey asked about the content, specific uses, and geographic needs for 43 topics that appeared on the 1990 census questionnaires: 20 of these were mandated topics, 13 were required topics, and 10 were programmatic topics.

Survey respondents were asked to mark whether they used each required or programmatic topic for any of the following six uses shown as worded on the questionnaire:

- compliance with Federal statute
- application for Federal funds and/or grants
- required by State or local legislation
- program and/or policy development
- analysis and/or program/policy evaluation
- other (court rulings/orders, marketing, etc.)

Respondents could mark as many of these uses as applied to each subject. For each use except program development and program evaluation, they also were asked to write in a specific legal citation or regulation governing the data application.

In addition, respondents were asked to identify the lowest geographic level (block, census tract, county, place, and so forth) for which they used/needed the data and to note the availability of alternative data sources, need for new subject items, and any general or specific comments they had. One reason the Census Bureau asked about the lowest geographic level was to determine the sample sizes necessary to produce reliable decennial census estimates.

## Promotional and Outreach Activities

To obtain input from as many and diverse non-Federal sources as possible, we launched a strong outreach campaign via multiple channels. The two most important of these activities involved placing articles in print and electronic news media and giving presentations. Articles appeared in at least 86 newsletters/magazines—including those of the 49 State Data Centers (SDCs)—explaining the non-Federal solicitation process and ways to obtain a survey form. Some publications ran the article in several issues. In addition, the process was posted on the Census Bureau's node of the Internet and disseminated via a Census Advisory (news release) to 9,000 organizations. We have anecdotal evidence from a number of non-Federal data users that the article was reproduced in many other publications and on other Internet bulletin boards, such as in city planning and county newsletters and in newsletters for specialized populations and interests (for example, on senior citizens and education).

Altogether, the NFDU survey was discussed at 143 conferences and workshops in 90 cities within 41 States and the District of Columbia. Staff from the 12 Census Regional Offices (ROs), SDCs and affiliates, and Census Bureau headquarters all played a role in this effort by making presentations and conducting workshops on filling out the survey form.

To aid the presenter and exhibitor in explaining the non-Federal solicitation process and the importance of the survey, the following presentation materials were developed:

- Full 20-minute presentation with standardized script and 15 slides
- Short 5-minute presentation script (no slides)
- List of questions and answers (for presenters only)
- Two handouts:

- 
- 1990 Census Subjects Classified by Federal Legislative Needs/(on reverse side) Examples of Subjects Classified by Federal Legislative Needs
  - Census Bureau Telephone Contacts

We produced 300 copies of the presentation materials. We provided 100 sets to the SDCs, 24 sets to the ROs (2 each), 10 sets to the Association of Public Data Users' Content Working Group, 1 set to each 2000 Census Advisory Committee member, and the remaining sets for on-demand requests.

### **Mailout and Other Distribution of the Survey**

The questionnaire package assembled for distribution contained the survey form, the handout—1990 Census Subjects Classified by Federal Legislative Needs, and a prepaid, preaddressed return envelope. All mailings were sent first class.

Distribution of questionnaire packages began the week of November 14, 1994, and ended March 17, 1995. (Attachment A gives an itemized distribution of the mailout.) For the initial headquarters mailout, a mailing list was drawn from a list of customer inquiries concerning the 1990 census summary tape file (STF) 3 and from individual RO customer lists. Also included in the initial mailout were State, local, and tribal governments and organizations; minority, religious, and community action organizations; libraries and genealogical organizations; Chambers of Commerce, trade, and other business organizations; academic researchers and research organizations; broadcast and print media; and many other types of census user groups.

The initial Stateside mailout consisted of 12,404 questionnaire packages. Subsequently, we assembled and mailed 8,530 packages to fill requests via the telephone, fax, Internet, letter, miscellaneous organizations, and requests from within the Census Bureau. We also filled requests for 29,849 packages from the SDCs or their affiliates in 18 States. In some cases, the SDCs supplied address labels and/or copies of their own cover letter for us to include in the mailout to their clients.

In total, 50,783 survey forms were distributed Stateside from headquarters through March 17, 1995, the end date for survey distribution. An additional 18,919 questionnaire packages were distributed from the ROs. Altogether, 69,702 questionnaires were distributed for the Stateside non-Federal data users solicitation process. There was no nonresponse follow-up operation. Completed questionnaires were returned directly to the Data Preparation Division in Jeffersonville, IN, which keyed responses on a flow basis through March 31, 1995.

### **Respondent Profile and Comparison With Pre-1990 Census Local Public Meetings**

We received a large number of survey forms from a wide range of respondents. The 8,913 forms processed during the non-Federal solicitation period (November 1994 through March 1995) represented about 13 percent of the 69,702 forms disseminated through all channels.

We heard from far more people during this non-Federal solicitation process than the number attending the series of Local Public Meetings (LPMs) held before the 1990 census to elicit public comment on census content. About 5,250 persons attended the LPMs, and not all of these persons provided suggestions or comments.

The NFDU survey respondents represented a broad spectrum of organizational affiliations (see table 1), much more diverse than those attending the pre-1990 census LPMs. Persons with nongovernment affiliations predominated as participants in the NFDU survey—58 percent of respondents reported a *nongovernment* affiliation spread across 16 detailed categories. In contrast, *government* participants constituted about 54 percent of all LPM attendees.

Local government comprised the largest single group of participants both responding to the NFDU survey and attending the LPMs, but this group accounted for only 18 percent of NFDU survey respondents, compared with 30 percent of LPM attendees.

Table 1.

**Government or Organizational Affiliation of NFDU Survey Respondents**

(Percents may not add to total due to rounding)

<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total	100.0
<b>Government</b>	<b>40.2</b>
State government	12.2
County government	8.5
Local government	18.1
Tribal government/organization	1.4
<b>Nongovernment</b>	<b>57.5</b>
Finance/insurance/real estate co.	2.6
University/college library or faculty	8.8
Manufacturing industry	1.1
Market research/advertising company	1.5
Retail/wholesale company	.9
Media (radio, TV, print)	2.6
Chamber of Commerce	1.9
Trade/professional organization	2.3
Library (non-academic)	3.3
Civic/community group	1.4
Minority organization	.9
Political organization	.1
Public interest group	.8
Social service agency	8.0
Religious organization	1.7
Private citizen	1.1
Other	18.6
Affiliation not provided	2.3

**Findings for the Required and Programmatic Topics**

Table 2 shows selected findings for the 13 required and 10 programmatic topics.

**Level (Percentage) of Use**

- In general, higher percentages of respondents reported using the required topics than the programmatic topics (table 2, column 1). The level of use is defined as the percentage of the 8,913 respondents reporting they used a topic.
- Among the 5 *required population* topics, labor force status had the highest percentage of reported use; two-thirds of all respondents reported they used this topic. In contrast, class of worker had the lowest percentage (54 percent). (It should be noted that class of worker is needed to classify correctly some industries, and industry is needed to classify correctly some occupations, so the level of use reported for occupation is probably a better indicator of the levels of need for class of worker and industry than the actual levels reported for these variables.)
- Among the 8 *required housing* topics, monthly rent recorded the highest percentage of use (51 percent) and house heating fuel, the lowest percentage (25 percent).
- The need for ancestry data was mentioned most often (by 46 percent of respondents) among the 5 *programmatic population* topics, while year last worked was mentioned least often (34 percent).

---

(Data for year last worked are used to obtain the experienced civilian labor force—basis of the EEO universe—so a higher proportion of respondents probably need this topic than actually reported they needed it.)

- For the 5 *programmatic housing* topics, value of home had the highest level of reported use (54 percent). Telephone in unit and condominium status were tied with the lowest level (27 percent).
- Government and nongovernment respondents tended to report similar patterns of use. Telephone in unit was one exception. Among government users, telephone in unit was ranked last, but among nongovernment users, it was second. Despite the overall low government ranking of this topic, it was used heavily by American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments.

It must be stressed that the level (percentage) of use reported for a topic does not necessarily reflect its importance. That is, there is no minimum percentage-of-use threshold that will automatically signify support of a topic and guarantee its inclusion in the 2000 census or, conversely, eliminate the topic from consideration if it should fall below this threshold.

### *Who Uses These Topics*

- The largest single user of each required and programmatic subject was *local governments*, which was the largest single group of survey respondents. Also reflecting the composition of the respondents, the majority of users of 9 of the 13 required subjects and 8 of the 10 programmatic subjects were nongovernment respondents. All 6 subjects used more heavily by government respondents were housing topics: sewage disposal and source of water (*programmatic*); and number of bedrooms, plumbing facilities, kitchen facilities, and units in structure (*required*).
- We received survey forms from every State and the District of Columbia. Not surprisingly, the largest number of survey forms came from California, also the most populous State (table 3). The 1,054 forms from California accounted for 12 percent of all forms returned, about the same proportion as California's population share of the U.S. total. Maine ranked second in number of survey respondents (577), followed by Ohio (414), Michigan (373), and New York (363).
- *State government* was the most frequently marked affiliation of respondents in 21 States, followed closely by *local government*, which was the most frequently marked affiliation in 20 States. *Social service agency* was the most commonly designated affiliation by respondents in 4 States.
- Of the detailed government or organizational affiliations (as shown in the stub of table 1), two predominated as having the highest percentages of their respondents reporting usage of the required and programmatic topics: tribal governments and university/college libraries and faculties (table 2, column 2). Higher percentages of respondents affiliated with *tribal governments* reported using 6 of the 8 *required housing* topics, 3 of the 5 *programmatic housing* topics, and 3 of the 5 *programmatic population* topics than respondents with any other affiliation.
- Respondents associated with *college libraries and faculties* recorded higher levels of use than other-affiliated respondents for 5 topics—4 economic subjects (labor force status, occupation, class of worker, and work status last year)—and residence 5 years ago (migration).
- A higher proportion of respondents affiliated with *Chambers of Commerce* used industry data than those of any other affiliation. *Social service agencies* reported the highest level of use for disability, and *non-academic libraries* reported the highest level of use for condominium status.

Table 2.

### Selected Findings of Required and Programmatic Topics: Survey of Census Needs of Non-Federal Data Users

Topic	Percent of all respondents whoreported using topic (1)	Government or organizational affiliation reporting highest percentage of its respondents using topic <sup>1</sup> (2)	Percent of those using topic—	
			Who needed topic at census tract level or below (3)	Who reported no alternative source for topic (4)
Required Topics - Population				
Labor force status	67	College library/faculty	57	73
Occupation	66	College library/faculty	n/a <sup>2</sup>	77
Industry	57	Chamber of Commerce	58	76
Disability	57	Social service agency	53	81
Class of worker	54	College library/faculty	58	81
Required Topics - Housing				
Monthly rent	51	Local government	59	68
Shelter costs (including utilities)	47	Tribal government	68	86
Units in structure	45	Local government	75	84
Number of bedrooms	35	Tribal government	75	80
Year moved into unit	33	Tribal government	74	79
Plumbing facilities	30	Tribal government	74	76
Kitchen facilities	26	Tribal government	73	73
House heating fuel	25	Tribal government	67	62
Programmatic Topics - Population				
Ancestry	46	Tribal government	54	85
Work status last year	44	College library/faculty	58	82
Residence 5 years ago (migration)	39	College library/faculty	66	89
Children ever born (fertility)	38	Tribal government	60	81
Year last worked	34	Tribal government	60	85
Programmatic Topics - Housing				
Value of home	54	Local government	73	80
Source of water	30	Tribal government	71	76
Sewage disposal	29	Tribal government	72	65
Telephone in unit	27	Tribal government	44	61
Condominium status	27	Library (non-academic)	75	82

<sup>1</sup> Excluded “political organization” affiliation as there were only 8 respondents.

<sup>2</sup> Not available because of processing problems.

#### Type of Use

The two top uses marked for **every** required and programmatic topic—regardless of government or nongovernment affiliation—were (1) program and policy development, and (2) analysis and/or program and policy evaluation. The distinction among uses was not clear-cut, however, as the data suggested that program planning and evaluation often were carried out to comply with Federal or State statutes or to apply for Federal funds.

- For the third major use marked for the required and programmatic topics, government respondents (including tribal governments) were more likely to mark “application for Federal funds/grants,” while nongovernment respondents were more likely to mark the “other” category, which included marketing uses as well as court rulings/orders.
- Review of the write-in legislative and regulatory citations associated with the uses is continuing. From our examination of the citations so far, it appears that non-Federal data users are providing the same citations and programs that were submitted earlier by Federal agencies. Some respondents also



provided State citations, and we are examining these citations as well. If we uncover evidence of unique Federal, State, local, or tribal requirements, we will inform the OMB.

### *Geographic Needs*

- Respondents expressed strong interest in small-area data (census tract level or below) for all required and programmatic subjects (table 2, column 3), demonstrating one of the most essential uses of the decennial census. The census is the **only** source of complete demographic, social, economic, and housing information for these small areas, towns, ZIP codes, and neighborhoods.
- For the *required* subjects, need for data at the census tract level or below ranged from 53 percent for disability to 58 percent each for class of worker and industry (*population*); and from 59 percent for monthly rent to 75 percent each for number of bedrooms and units in structure (*housing*).

For the *programmatic* subjects, need for data at the census tract level or below ranged from 54 percent for ancestry to 66 percent for residence 5 years ago/migration (*population*); and from 44 percent for telephone in unit to 75 percent for condominium status (*housing*).

- Government and nongovernment respondents generally reported their need for small area data very similarly for all the topics.
- Tribal governments/organizations reported strong need for data for American Indian or Alaska Native areas for all the topics.

Table 3.

### **Number of NFDU Survey Forms Received and Most Frequently Reported Affiliation, by State**

State	Number of forms received	Most frequently reported affiliation
United States, total	8,913	Local government
Alabama	89	Local government
Alaska	68	State government
Arizona	143	State government
Arkansas	58	State government
California	1,054	Local government
Colorado	129	Local government
Connecticut	61	State government
Delaware	73	State government
District of Columbia	137	Trade/professional organization
Florida	201	County government
Georgia	223	Local government
Hawaii	84	State government
Idaho	57	Local government
Illinois	280	Local government
Indiana	186	Local government
Iowa	259	Local government
Kansas	112	Social service agency
Kentucky	120	State government
Louisiana	74	Social service agency
Maine	577	Local government
Maryland	166	County government
Massachusetts	132	State government
Michigan	373	Local government
State	Number of forms received	Most frequently reported affiliation
Minnesota	118	State government
Mississippi	49	University/college library or faculty
Missouri	155	Social service agency
Montana	68	State government
Nebraska	60	State government
Nevada	42	State government

New Hampshire	51	Local government
New Jersey	222	Local government
New Mexico	84	State government
New York	363	Local government
North Carolina	230	Local government
North Dakota	32	State government
Ohio	414	Social service agency
Oklahoma	63	Local government
Oregon	81	Local government
Pennsylvania	325	County government
Rhode Island	20	State government
South Carolina	197	Local government
South Dakota	39	State government
Tennessee	164	State government
Texas	158	Local government
Utah	57	State government
Vermont	31	State government
Virginia	238	Local government
Washington	185	Local government
West Virginia	37	State government
Wisconsin	252	University/college library or faculty
Wyoming	146	State government
State not reported	376	

### Alternative Sources of Data

- For each required and programmatic topic, the majority of data users reported that no alternative source (administrative records, surveys, etc.) existed that would meet their data needs at the lowest geographic level they required and with the necessary cross-tabulations (table 2, column 4).
- The percentage of users of a topic reporting no alternative source showed more variation for housing subjects than for population subjects. On the *housing* side, the percentage varied from 62 percent for house heating fuel to 86 percent for shelter costs (*required*); and from 61 percent for telephone in unit to 82 percent for condominium status (*programmatic*).
- On the *population* side, the percentage reporting no alternative source ranged from 73 percent for labor force status to 81 percent each for disability and class of worker (*required*); and from 81 percent for children ever born to 89 percent for residence 5 years ago (*programmatic*). The high percentage reported for residence 5 years ago underscores the difficulty data users would have in obtaining equivalent data if this topic were not included in the decennial census. It is a key variable in estimating migration at the local level and among specific population groups (such as for veterans and new immigrant streams).
- The majority of users who indicated there was an alternative source for their topic other than the decennial census cited the source. It is not clear, however, if the data source would be comparable across the country, or whether users in all areas of the country would have access to such a source. Caution should be used in drawing the conclusion that the alternative source could easily replace the census topic. Thus, use of alternative data sources must be examined carefully for universality of coverage and comparability of concept before being considered as substitutes for decennial census data, which already meet these two criteria, as well as being asked at a single point in time.

### Findings for the Mandated Topics

Table 4 shows selected findings for the 20 mandated topics. Fewer questions were asked about the mandated topics than about the required or programmatic topics as mandated topics do not require further justification to be included in the 2000 census.

---

### *Level (Percentage) of Use*

- Respondents generally reported higher percentages of use for the mandated topics than for the required or programmatic topics (table 4, column 1).
- Age had the highest percentage of reported use (87 percent) among the 15 *mandated population* topics, while year of entry had the lowest percentage (45 percent). Among the 5 *mandated housing* topics, tenure (house owned or rented) recorded the highest percentage of use (64 percent) and acreage/farm residence, the lowest percentage (47 percent).

### *Who Uses These Topics*

- Like the required and programmatic topics, the largest single user of each mandated topic was by *local governments*. However, the majority of users of each mandated topic were nongovernment respondents.
- *Non-academic libraries* had the highest percentage of their respondents reporting usage of 8 of the mandated topics, and *college libraries and faculties* posted the highest levels of use for 4 topics (table 4, column 2).

### *Geographic Needs*

- Respondents reported strong need for small-area data (census tract level or below) for all mandated topics, but the percentages generally were not as high as for the required or programmatic topics (table 4, column 3).
- Among the *population* topics, need for data at the census tract level or below ranged from 51 percent for veteran status to 62 percent for journey to work.
- Among the *housing* topics, need for data at the census tract level or below ranged from 59 percent for acreage/farm residence to 73 percent for year structure built.

Table 4.  
**Selected Findings of Mandated Topics: Survey of Census Needs of Non-Federal Data Users**

Topic	Percent of all respondents whoreported using topic (1)	Government or organizational affiliation reporting highest percentage of its respondents using topic <sup>1</sup> (2)	Percent of those using topic— Who needed topic at census tract level or below (3)
<b>Mandated Topics - Population</b>			
Age	87	College library/faculty	59
Income	84	Market research/advertising co.	61
Sex	83	College library/faculty	58
Race	81	College library/faculty	60
Education	80	College library/faculty	58
Marital status	72	Library (non-academic)	59
Hispanic origin	69	Library (non-academic)	61
Place of work	68	Chamber of Commerce	60
Journey to work	62	Chamber of Commerce	62
Relationship	62	Tribal government	61
Language spoken at home	59	Library (non-academic)	59
Citizenship	56	Library (non-academic)	56
Place of birth	53	Library (non-academic)	56
Veteran status	50	Tribal government	51
Year of entry	45	Library (non-academic)	58
<b>Mandated Topics - Housing</b>			
Tenure	64	Chamber of Commerce	66
Vehicles available	56	Library (non-academic)	65
Number of rooms	55	Tribal government	67
Year structure built	55	Local government	68
Acreage/farm residence	47	Library (non-academic)	59

<sup>1</sup> Excluded "political organization" affiliation as there were only 8 respondents.

## Limitations

The NFDU survey was not designed to undergo stringent statistical evaluation. The survey was not based on a representative sample, so no inferences can be drawn about the Nation's non-Federal data user population as a whole. Nevertheless, the survey did reach a broad cross-section of data users.

## Conclusions

The NFDU survey yielded a high volume of information on a large number of topics. Four major themes emerged from analysis of the findings for the 20 mandated topics and the 23 required and programmatic topics:

1. Evidence of use of all topics
2. Widespread need for small-area data for all topics
3. Dominance of program planning and program evaluation as the major uses reported for the required and programmatic topics (we did not collect this information for mandated topics)
4. Lack of alternative sources of data for the required and programmatic topics (we did not collect this information for mandated topics)

---

In short, the non-Federal data solicitation process identified support (that included State, local, and tribal governments; and business, research, and other nongovernmental organizations) for subjects classified as required or programmatic in the Federal inquiry. The Census Bureau will continue to evaluate current and future legislation that either further supports requirements for current data topics or imposes requirements for new ones.

## Other Data Needs

The NFDU survey also asked if there were other topics needed for the 2000 census or an alternative data collection method that did not appear on the 1990 census questionnaires. Despite the caution to the respondent on the survey form that opportunity for new content would be limited, nearly 700 forms included specific uses and geographic needs for additional topics (see Attachment B for a list of these topics grouped by population, housing, and other).

A number of content recommendations were for some of the same housing subjects asked in the 1960, 1970, and 1980 censuses but not in the 1990 census. These suggestions highlight a recurring need for data on the structural condition and energy consumption of America's housing stock. Other suggested content items reflect more contemporary concerns and demands of today's society, such as child care needs, computer usage, health care services, and crime.

We are reviewing the entries for any unique legislative or programmatic requirements associated with the suggested content items and will alert the OMB if we uncover any.

## Implications for 2000 Census Content Planning

The non-Federal solicitation process is an essential component of 2000 census content planning. The findings of the NFDU survey will be used in the Census Bureau's deliberations for determining the content of the 2000 census questionnaires, along with the Federal agency content requirements assessed last year, the results of the content testing program taking place next year, and the ongoing consultation with stakeholders.

## Dissemination Plans

Attachment C provides the dissemination plans for the findings for the non-Federal solicitation process. The final report (without attachments) will be posted on the Internet. In addition, an announcement explaining how to obtain the final report will be distributed to key national media and released to other media through a Census Bureau news release.

## Participants in the Content Planning Process

The decisions on content for a decennial census involve several key participants: the Census Bureau, the OMB, the Secretary of Commerce, and Congress. The *Census Bureau* is delegated the responsibility of evaluating data requirements based on legislative mandates, extensive consultation with stakeholders, and other important factors; determining which questions best meet these requirements; and recommending these questions to the Secretary of Commerce.

The *OMB*, as coordinator of Federal statistical activities, ensures that the recommended questions meet essential data needs and that they conform to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

The *Secretary of Commerce*, acting under the authority of Title 13, U.S. Code, is required to report to Congress twice on census content—on general topics at least 3 years before the decennial census date, and on the specific question wording at least 2 years before the decennial census date. Thus, *Congress* makes the final decision on census content.

---

## Other Related Work

### *Association of Public Data Users (APDU) Assessment of Data Uses*

APDU was awarded a contract to provide an independent assessment of the content requirements of non-Federal data users. The APDU distributed the Census Bureau's NFDU survey and gave presentations to its members and their constituent agencies and organizations urging them to fill it out. About 1,300 questionnaire packages and 10 sets of presentation materials were shipped to the Association's headquarters in Princeton, New Jersey. APDU placed articles in several issues of its newsletter about the non-Federal solicitation and the members' role in it. They also included in their questionnaire package a Census Data Use Description Form, which they designed to elicit detailed applications of the subject items, as dictated by laws, regulations, and programmatic uses.

A Steering Committee of APDU's Year 2000 Census Content Working Group was formed to analyze the Data Use forms and compile illustrations of applications of subject items, particularly those at risk of not being included in the 2000 census (the programmatic topics). Two final reports were submitted to the Census Bureau as a result of these activities: Report I on April 12, 1995, containing an overview and summary of responses, and Report II on June 1, 1995, containing detailed case studies (Attachment D).

### *State Data Center Surveys*

Two surveys of the SDCs have been conducted: one coordinated in 1993 by the North Carolina SDC and one undertaken in 1994 as part of the research for the Committee on National Statistics Panel on Census Requirements in the Year 2000 and Beyond (National Academy of Sciences). Results of both these surveys are shown in Attachment E.

## Other Materials

The following background/supporting materials are available upon request by contacting Gloria Porter, Bureau of the Census, Room 3555/3, Washington, DC 20233; telephone 301-457-4019; or fax 301-457-2744.

1. Initial and Detailed Action Plans to OMB for Solicitation of 2000 Census Content Needs From Non-Federal Data Users
2. List of Known Publications and Other Media That Carried a Non-Federal Solicitation Article and Actual Articles as Available
3. Conferences at Which the Non-Federal Solicitation Process was Discussed and Activity Log for Regional Offices
4. Outreach Materials and Handouts For Non-Federal Solicitation
5. Questionnaire Package
6. List of Selected Agencies/Organizations Receiving the Survey of Census Needs of Non-Federal Data Users in Initial November 1994 Mailout
7. Detailed Analytical Tables From the Survey of Census Needs of Non-Federal Data Users